



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,447	08/15/2003	Peter So	MAIT-009XX	1584
	590 02/16/200 . SCHURGIN. GAGN	7 NEBIN & LEBOVICI LLP	EXAM	IINER
TEN POST OFFICE SQUARE BOSTON, MA 02109			JOHNS, ANDREW W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
		4		
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 DA	YS	02/16/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/642,447	SO ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew W. Johns	2624	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH: , cause the application to become ABAN	TION.  be timely filed  from the mailing date of this communication  DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	-
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
•	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		prosecution as to the merits is	:
closed in accordance with the practice under E	•	•	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-29</u> is/are pending in the application.		•	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•		
8) Claim(s) <u>1-29</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 05 May 2004 is/are: a)	⊠ accepted or b)☐ objected	d to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s)	is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(	d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached C	ffice Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents			
2. Certified copies of the priority documents			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		ceived in this National Stage	
application from the International Bureau	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not rec	ceived.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Sum		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		lail Date mal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	, ,	

Application/Control Number: 10/642,447

Art Unit: 2624

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Page 2

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:
  - I. Claims 1-10 and 24-29, drawn to a method of generating three-dimensional images of a tissue, classified in class 382, subclass 133.
  - II. Claims 11-23, drawn to a system for providing a three-dimensional image of a region, classified in class 348, subclass 79.
- 2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(e)). In this case the system defined by the claims of group II do not require the specific sequence of operations defined by the method of group I, and can be used to generate images of tissues in substantially different ways. For example the system might section and image the tissues without imaging a plurality of layers in a plurality of volumes of the tissue, or might sequence the imaging and sectioning operations in a different manner than the claimed method.
- 3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see M.P.E.P. § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 C.F.R. § 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of the other invention.

- 5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i).
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Johns whose telephone number is (571) 272-7391. The examiner in normally available Monday through Friday, at least during the hours of 9:00 am to 3:00 pm Eastern Time. The examiner may also be contacted by e-mail using the address: andrew.johns@uspto.gov. (Applicant is reminded of the Office policy regarding e-mail communications. See M.P.E.P. § 502.03)

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Bella, can be reached at (571) 272-7778. The fax phone number for this art unit is (571) 273-8300. In

Art Unit: 2624

order to ensure prompt delivery to the examiner, all unofficial communications should be clearly labeled as "Draft" or "Unofficial."

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

A. Johns 14 February 2007

ANDREW W. JOHNS